

REVIEW–DISCUSSION

THE *LEXICON HISTORIOGRAPHICUM
GRAECUM ET LATINUM*:
AN INTERIM REVIEW

Carminé Ampolo and Ugo Fantasia, edd., *Lexicon Historiographicum Graecum et Latinum (LHG&L)*, 3 vols. Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2004–15. Vols. 1–3: €20.00; €20.00; €30.00. ISBN 978-88-7642-147-5; 978-88-7642-187-7; 978-88-7642-540-0.

The new *Lexicon Historiographicum Graecum et Latinum*, published from Pisa under the editorship of Carminé Ampolo, Ugo Fantasia, and Leone Porciani, has reached its third volume. It has brought itself to the letter zeta. This seems an appropriate moment to take stock, and reflect on the burgeoning enterprise. What can we say, so far, about the achievement of this new and unusual collaborative endeavour? What insights has its structure brought to our study of ancient historiography? What methodological issues does it present?

The *Lexicon* is self-abbreviated to *LHG&L*. (We should applaud the decision, which *FRHist* also made.¹ It is a public service to choose one's own abbreviation at the outset, and not wait for other scholars to invent a dozen slightly different ones.) *LHG&L* sets out its wares in the general introduction to volume one. Once complete, it is to be:

un repertorio ordinato alfabeticamente, ottenuto raggruppando fra loro nei limiti del possibile i lemmi linguisticamente e concettualmente imparentati (con frequenti rimandi dai lemmi secondari a quelli principali, scelti in base a criteri il più possibile omogenei), di tutti i termini che concernono l'attività storiografica. Quindi sono considerati gli aspetti programmatici e metodologici (lessico della conoscenza, dell'indagine, della verifica, della dichiarazione d'intenti, lessico della memoria e della selezione), l'atteggiamento e l'*animus* dello storico (con il lessico della polemica e della critica), il suo rapporto con i destinatari dell'opera (lessico della comunicazione e dell'edizione) nonché gli aspetti formali del suo

¹ Tim Cornell, in Bispham et al. (2013) vii: 'one further point on which we are all agreed is that our preferred abbreviation for the title of this work is *FRHist* ...'

prodotto, cioè la partizione e strutturazione dell'opera, le modalità dei rimandi interni, i generi e sottogeneri della storiografia' (I.7).²

As of early 2017, *LHG&L* has covered terms in a quarter of the Greek alphabet. Latin material, thus far, has appeared only to illuminate the discussions of comparable Greek terms. However, the intention is that the Latin side of *LHG&L* will follow hard upon completion of the Greek.³

The layout and the emphases of *LHG&L*'s entries are central to its enterprise. The structure of these entries is consistent. After the lemma and the definition comes a section on the etymology of the lemma. I must confess to harbouring a mild scepticism as to the systematic usefulness of this section. Etymology, in my view, does not shed consistent light on the deployment of most historiographical terms.

To judge from the tone of some of the entries, this scepticism is occasionally shared by the contributors. John Marincola is appropriately sardonic on *alētheia*: 'Discussion of the word's origin has been extensive, exacerbated perhaps by the importance attributed to the etymology by Heidegger ...' (II.7). It will certainly be interesting to see, in due course, whether anything more can be done on this front for a word like *prophasis*. Thucydides and Polybius notoriously use *prophasis* in almost exactly contradictory ways. Neither of these ways is a self-evidently obvious extension from either of the word's two possible etymologies. Compare Hornblower's appropriately cautious treatment of this issue in his note on that word in Thucydides.⁴

On the other hand, there are occasions when etymologies turn out to be relevant to usage. Even false ones can be helpful. For example, the hypothesis that *hermēneus* is originally related to the name of the god Hermes is historically most implausible. But Paola Schirripa, in the entry for the word, rightly points out the interest that the ancient sources take in it (III.201). Such considerations can also potentially be useful when considering the formation of comparable terms.

In any event, most entries sensibly do not belabour the issue when etymology turns out not to be especially illuminating. More generally, *LHG&L* is also sensible in avoiding dogmatism. It leaves out completely portions of its standard coverage for a word if there is literally nothing to be said on that score about it. As the editors put it, 'Questa rigida standardizzazione formale dei singoli lemmi ... è controbilanciata dalla libertà che è stata accordata a ciascun

² In this article, references of the form 'Roman Numeral, Arabic Number' without additional qualification are usually to the three current volumes of *LHG&L* (published respectively in 2004, 2007, and 2015).

³ I.7: 'Il programma iniziale, limitato all'ambito greco, è stato ampliato, per impulso di Carmine Ampolo, alla storiografia latina'.

⁴ Thuc. 1.23.6, with Hornblower (2003) 64–5.

collaboratore di sviluppare l'ultima e più importante sezione della voce secondo i criteri che abbia ritenuto più opportuni—fermo restando l'impegno a dar conto nel modo più esauriente possibile dell'uso dei termini oggetto della trattazione nell'intero sviluppo della storiografia antica' (I.8). We see this, for example, in Maria Teresa Schettino's contribution on *epibolē* (III.182–7). *Epibolē* is a concept which even the Neo-Platonists do not seem to have gone as far as personifying. Some elements of its entry are therefore judiciously abbreviated.

The issue of selectivity is crucial in this lexicon, as in all such endeavours. This issue becomes acute with regard to the next habitual section for each item in *LHG&L*. Section 2 presents words that are linguistically connected to the item under discussion. There is a proviso to this coverage: 'limitatamente a quelli significativi in rapporto alla trattazione'.

This is where the issue becomes rather debatable. Consider, for example, Cristina Cuscunà's article on *elpizdō* (III.119–28). In this instance, we find (119) two 'termini linguisticamente connessi': *anelpistos* and *euelpis*. These are well chosen. *Euelpis*, in particular, attains to a thematic importance in Thucydides. Cuscunà duly examines Thucydides's description of the initial attitude of the Athenians to the Sicilian Expedition,⁵ where the term is especially significant (126).

Anelpistos and *euelpis*, then, are indeed judiciously selected. But why does the list end there? The noun *elpis* itself is doubtless excluded as being merely the cognate noun. Cuscunà's article deals with instances of that as well as the verb. Looking *elpis* up in the *Lexicon* (III.128) appropriately sends one back to *elpizdō*.

Other exclusions are a little less straightforward. Why, for instance, does *euelpis* feature amongst the 'termini linguisticamente connessi', when, say, *duselpis* does not? The word and its own immediate cognates have historiographical attestation. Archidamus goes away *duselpis* when his plea on behalf of Sphodrias seems to fail in Xenophon's *Hellenica*;⁶ it may be significant that this *duselpistia* ultimately turns out to be as unmerited in the light of subsequent events as were the inflated Athenian hopes for the Sicilian Expedition in Thucydides, and this might lend weight to Cuscunà's own paragraphs on Xenophon and *elpis* (III.126–7). The article for *elpizdō* does identify words of historiographical significance that are related to its main subject. It is not, perhaps, straightforward to determine why that list ends where it does. The absence of hope, or pessimistic expectation, is as potentially meaningful as (excessive) optimism.

The third section of the entries deals with personifications of the lemma. This section investigates use of the lemma as a proper name, particularly in

⁵ Thuc. 6.24.3.

⁶ Xen. *Hell.* 5.4.31.

the field of cultic observance. As noted above, with regard to *epibolē*, this is not, for obvious reasons, a section that sees invariable use in practice. Where it does apply, however, it is potentially very interesting. In certain cases, this section delivers a salutary reminder that the ideologies with which historiography interacts have left traces in the world outside these particular texts. Good examples here would be William Desmond on the altar of *Eleos* at Athens (III.102 with Philostratus *Ep.* 39, and further treatment at 108) and Olivier Gengler on *dikaios* (III.71).

There are, inevitably, certain absences. *Dekhomai*, is, in theory, subsumed under Andrea Zambrini's article on *apodekhomai* (III.59 directs the reader to II.73). We do not find out anything in the latter entry's section on personifications and proper names about the cult of *Dexiōn*, 'The Receiver', at Athens.⁷ On the other hand, the likely medical cast to the cult of *Dexiōn* may well have discouraged its mention in a lexicon devoted to historiography.

In any event, one suspects that this area of emphasis for *LHG&L* will bear special fruit in the volumes to come. These may grapple, amongst other possibilities, with the evidence for the cult of Athena Pronoia and its attendant complexities.⁸ Once the Latin side of *LHG&L* is underway, we may also see the wealth of Roman evidence for the personification of historiographically relevant virtues and attributes and associated cultic sites. Examples of the latter might include the temples of *Mens* and *Fides* on the Capitol dedicated by M. Aemilius Scaurus towards the end of the second century BCE.⁹

The fourth section deals with the evidence for the term in question presented by the ancient lexicographers. As with etymologies, this is only fitfully revealing if the reader is mainly interested in the deployment of the term in historiography. It is nice to learn, for the sake of completeness, that Hesychius consistently defines *etumos* (and its variants) as '*alēthēs*' *vel sim.*, in Cinzia Bearzot's entry on the former word (III.212). This fact is not necessarily all that enlightening about the word's actual usage. By contrast, the discussion later in the same entry about the ways in which *etumos* and *alēthēs* are not, in practice, quite strictly synonymous is a lot more interesting (214).

The fifth and sixth sections of each entry are the meatiest. They are what most users of *LHG&L* will be interested in reading. The fifth section is a bibliography; the sixth is discussion of the term in question. It is here that *LHG&L*'s stated aims come to the fore. How, then, does the *LHG&L*'s format help to contribute to our understanding of the key terms in ancient historiography? What can it tell us about the modalities of their usage?

⁷ Contrast *IG* II/III² 1252.

⁸ D. 25.34.

⁹ Cic. *N.D.* 2.61, with Clark (2007) 117–9.

The editors thoughtfully anticipate a number of possible objections to their enterprise at its outset. To judge from the length of treatment (I.8–9), the primary objection they anticipate is whether it is licit to regard ‘*storiografia antica*’ as a discrete genre, ‘come “genere” distinto e autonomo’ (8), and what, if so, the nature of that genre should be considered to have been. Their reasonable rejoinder is that the lexical analyses which comprise their endeavour do not entail a party-line on these hot (or, at least, tepid) topics. It is to be ‘*uno strumento di studio e di lavoro*’ (I.9).

This is quite reasonable. After all, the ambivalent standing of several other ancient (maybe-) ‘genres’ has not proven a serious impediment to their analysis as more-or-less distinct modes of literary activity. One thinks of didactic poetry (technically just a sort of epic, by a strict reading of some ancient thought on the subject).¹⁰ An even more extreme case is the ancient novel, where explicit meditation on generic boundaries is, in antiquity, far to seek. By comparison, the student of historiography, who has an extant treatise actually about how history ought to be written (whatever one may think, in practice, of what Lucian says in it), is sitting pretty.

To judge from its first three volumes, the essential viability of ‘*storiografia antica*’ as a generic concept is not, in fact, *LHG&L*’s most pressing methodological issue. A sampling of entries suggests a couple of more significant ones. These relate to the selection of terms for discussion, and to the texts that are brought into play for the terms that are discussed.

The issue of selectivity is one to which we have already alluded above. *Euelpis* is in the field of view. *Duselpis* is not. It is true that one has to stop somewhere. The need for selectivity is a particularly important consideration with regard to a language like Greek, where a welter of compounds is commonplace for many words. The need redoubles in a lexicon obliged to make much use of Thucydides, who welds prefixes and suffixes to common words with the relish of an armourer tooling up a cyborg super-soldier.

Selectivity in the listing of words related to defined terms can, then, be defended. A more potentially perplexing issue is the selection of the terms that are to be defined in the first place. As we have seen, *LHG&L* sets out to cover ‘*tutti i termini che concernono l’attività storiografica*’. Does it really seem to be managing to achieve this?

The editors are, again, commendably aware of the methodological issues here, and meet them head-on: ‘*Pur consapevoli che ogni selezione è in una certa misura arbitraria, siamo tuttavia convinti che il ventaglio delle voci programmate nell’LHG&L sia sufficientemente ampio da render conto di tutti i termini e concetti che ineriscono al “mestiere di storico” nel senso più ampio che questa comoda, benché controversa, espressione è suscettibile di assumere*’

¹⁰ As at Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.46–7. For discussion, see Volk (2002) 29.

(I.7–8). To an extent, the first three volumes of *LHG&L* justify this assertion. Most of the terms that are key to discussions of classical historiography, whether in antiquity itself or the present day, are in evidence, and furnished with ample, analytical articles: *aitia* (by Catherine Darbo-Peschanski, I.22–32); *akribēs* (by Ugo Fantasia, I.36–66); *alētheia* (by John Marincola, II.7–29); *empeiria* (by Anna Magonetto, III.128–35).

There are gaps, however. While selectivity is unavoidable, some of these are a little surprising. The Introduction, as we have seen, notes that amongst the areas that *LHG&L* takes as its historiographical ambit are ‘gli aspetti formali del suo prodotto, cioè la partizione e strutturazione dell’opera’ (I.8). This being so, it is odd that *biblos* and its cognates seem to lack an entry. Polybius, Diodorus, and Appian alike embrace the book as a unit of structural division. Polybius notes his usual allotment of two years to each Olympiad,¹¹ while Diodorus and Appian explicitly assign subject-matter in advance to particular books, or groups of books.¹² Lucian derides historians who plume themselves upon the number of books to which they run.¹³

In light of *LHG&L*’s emphases with regard to its source material (on which more below), one suspects that this may be related to the fact that explicit statements about book-division in Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon usually range from the negligible to the non-existent. For substantially preserved works, it is in the subsequent centuries that the matter begins to enjoy a more prominent profile. Such discussions might well be subsumed, in due course, under the discussion of *logos*. Indeed, the preserved (and probably inauthentic) openings to the books of Xenophon’s *Anabasis* that succeed the first seem to use *logos* in the sense that other writers allot to *biblos* and its cognates.¹⁴ If this is to be *LHG&L*’s strategy, however, a cross-reference, at the very least, would have been helpful.

More generally, the criteria for including some terms and leaving others out are not always especially transparent. *Eleos*, as we have noted above, receives a full and interesting article from William Desmond (III.102–11). Why, though, is *eleos* an indispensably historiographical term when, say, *aretē*, apparently, is not? True enough, Polybius avers that Phylarchus attempts to provoke *eleos* in his audience (Polybius 2.56, as discussed by Desmond at III.103). This identifies *eleos* as an emotion that might be solicited from a historiographer’s readership. One can therefore see a case for *eleos* as a key historiographical term. But *aretē*, equally, could be envisaged as a response amongst the reader-

¹¹ Pol. 9.1.1.

¹² Diod. 1.4.6; App. *Praef.* 53–61.

¹³ Lucian *Hist. Conscr.* 32.

¹⁴ As at Xen. *Anab.* 2.1.1.

ship to historiographical activity. So, for example, Diodorus, extolling the benefits of the activity in the proem to the first book of his work, asserts that men come to seek the lasting glory that history can memorialize through the exercise of *aretē*.¹⁵

It is true that little other Greek historiography focuses explicitly on *aretē* as an intended consequence of historiography. But cross-pollination with *virtus*, an intended result which does feature much more strongly in Latin historiography, will ultimately prove interesting.¹⁶ More importantly, *eleos* does not feature that prominently, either, as an explicitly intended purpose of historiography outside a small range of texts (predominantly Polybius, in this case, rather than Diodorus), though such pity as an *implicit* goal, or at least as a likely result, is better attested.¹⁷ Even in Polybius, the allusion to the production of *eleos* in the audience is drowned out by many references to history's utility to the reader, and by some references to its pleasures, as well.¹⁸ *Eleos*, as Desmond amply demonstrates, is something which *appears* a lot in historiography. It does so in potentially interesting ways. But, again, the same could be said of *aretē*, as the literature on that word's somewhat cryptic appearance in Thucydides' necrology for Nicias well demonstrates.¹⁹

It is possible, with any selective and interpretative lexicon, to nit-pick *ad infinitum* about what should, or should not, be included in it. The mere absence of *aretē* does not disturb the universe. Moreover, the possibly ameliorating effect of historiography upon its readers does crop up at other points in *LHG&L* (as, for example, in Donatella Erdas' article on *epanorthōsis*, at III.173). *Aretē* itself also crops up elsewhere, if only in passing. Marco Bettalli's article on *doxa* shrewdly notes its use by Plutarch to describe the temple of *Honos et Virtus* vowed by M. Claudius Marcellus (III.75).²⁰

The point of principle, however, remains. How do we distinguish between a concept that is historiographically significant, and a term which simply appears, and is subjected to interesting treatments, in works of historiography? What puts *eleos* on one side of this divide and *aretē* on the other?

The question presents itself with particular force in the case of words like *eleos* and *aretē*. But they are not alone. Many other terms present a similar issue, albeit to a lesser degree. Is *poliorkia*, say, a term to be considered for later inclusion? The status of sieges as a possible defining feature of history as a genre

¹⁵ Diod. 1.2.3.

¹⁶ Cf., for example, Sal. *Jug.* 4.5, on the Roman *imagines*.

¹⁷ As, for example, in Thucydides' description of Mycalessos (Thuc. 7.30.3).

¹⁸ For both utility and pleasure in play, see the denigration of Hieronymus as a historiographical subject at Pol. 7.7.8.

¹⁹ Thuc. 7.86.5.

²⁰ Plut. *Marc.* 28.2.

is attested by Plutarch.²¹ For Plutarch, sieges are implicitly the sorts of things, expected in a history, which might be downplayed in comparison to apparently more trifling matters in the writing of a biography (as noted by Paolo Desideri in the article on *bios* at III.16, with appropriate caution about taking this too prescriptively). Tacitus laments that he, unlike his predecessors who were fortunate enough to have more exciting times upon which to spend their energies, will not enjoy the opportunity to expatiate upon *expugnationes urbium*;²² Lucian fastens upon the description of sieges as an area in which it is necessary for the competent historian to exercise a certain self-control, like his eminent predecessors.²³ And, of course, there are the extant historiographical sieges to consider: Thucydides on Plataea;²⁴ Caesar on Alesia;²⁵ Appian on Numantia.²⁶

Yet one can also see the arguments for thinking that admitting the likes of *poliorkia* might open the floodgates to an unacceptable degree. Tacitus, in the passage cited in the previous paragraph, vocally regrets not having the opportunity to write about agrarian legislation, as well as sieges. It would take a very ardent completist to assert that this means *leges agrariae* will, in due course, merit an entry. *LHG&L*'s task of determining what truly marks out a term or a concept as significantly 'historiographical' is, to a considerable extent, an impossible one. It is easy to see the two extremes which one has to avoid in choosing terms for explication in a work of this sort. Too exclusionary a policy runs the risk of producing a work limited to *akribēs*, *alētheia*, *historia*, *khṛēsimos*, and not much else. If, on the other hand, one errs in the direction of inclusivity, one runs the risk of a dropsical work or, worse, a simple exercise in list-making—the historiographical equivalent of Nabokov's university avenue in *Pale Fire*, containing all the trees that are mentioned by Shakespeare.²⁷ It is less easy to determine the point on the spectrum between these two extremes which a lexicon should inhabit. On occasion, though not with deliberate caprice, *LHG&L* seems a little unsure, or inconsistent, with regard to its position on this spectrum.

The distribution of space between such terms as do make the cut is a related issue. On the whole, the decisions taken on this count thus far seem judicious. The young A. E. Housman, if popular legend is to be believed, absented himself from Benjamin Jowett's lectures, having censoriously decided,

²¹ Plut. *Alex.* 1.2.

²² Tac. *Ann.* 4.32.1.

²³ Lucian *Hist. Conscr.* 57.

²⁴ Thuc. 2.71–8.

²⁵ Caes. *Gal.* 7.68–90.

²⁶ App. *Hisp.* 392–425.

²⁷ V. Nabokov, *Pale Fire*, Commentary on Lines 47–8. Cf. Thuc. 3.81.3; *BNJ* 269 F 13; *FRHist* 9 F 40; Hdn. 1.12.2.

on the basis of the latter's pronunciation of the word *akribōs*, that the Regius Professor lacked competence at Greek.²⁸ Even Housman would not have been able to assert that *akribēs* receives insufficient attention in *LHG&L*. Ugo Fantasia's article on this word takes up a little under thirty pages (I.36–66). This is getting up towards half the length of the whole first fascicle. In light of the term's importance, the magnitude seems entirely merited.

There are a few cases, however, where relative allotments of space seem a little counter-instinctual. A instance of this is Antonio L. Chávez Reino's entry for *epimetrōn logos* (III.191–200). The *epimetrōn logos*, for the uninitiated, is a narrative device mentioned by Polybius, who talks about its use in other, now fragmentary, historians. It and its cognate phrases are not common, as Chávez Reino notes ('El uso figurado de *epimetron* no es frecuente', III.193). Apart from their usage in Polybius, the main authority that Chávez Reino cites in the article is the distinctly non-historiographical Sextus Empiricus (*ibid.*).

Nonetheless, Chávez Reino's article on this Polybian term is nine and a half pages long (III.191–200). There are certainly good reasons to justify this length of treatment. Knotty terms need more space, regardless of their historiographical distribution. *Epimetrōn logos*, because of the loss of the texts to which Polybius principally applies it, has a usage that needs to be deduced rather than simply observed. Moreover, such a lavish allotment of space means that *LHG&L*, where this word is concerned, at least, avoids the error of implicitly privileging the practices of fully extant historiography over that which does not survive mostly intact. This is a consideration ever more urgent, as research into post-Thucydidean, pre-Polybian historiography becomes increasingly a growth field.²⁹ All the same, there is, perhaps, something a little disproportionate when a historiographical term essentially limited to Polybius and his fragmentary subjects receives nine and a half pages of coverage. Marco Bettalli's article on *doxa* in the same volume (III.75–7) barely stretches to three.

One should not make too much of these varying scales of treatment. They are not usually too much of an issue. Something else is a little more troubling, in light of *LHG&L*'s aspirations to historiographical comprehensiveness. This is a slight skew that is occasionally detectable in its use of sources. The Introduction to *LHG&L* claims for its ambit a broad chronological sweep of ancient historiography, 'dalle origini *alla tarda età imperiale*' (I.8, my emphasis).

In practice, *LHG&L*'s practice tends to be a little more constrained than this mission statement asserts. Desmond's article on *eleos* is a case in point. As we have already seen, this gives admirably ample coverage to such interesting

²⁸ Hendrickson (1937) 463.

²⁹ See now, for example, the essays in G. Parmeggiani (2014) (reviewed by F. K. Maier in *Histos* 10 (2016): xxix–xxxiv).

matters as the Altar of Pity at Athens. The analysis of pity in Thucydides occupies a couple of pages (III.105–6). By contrast, the treatment of pity in Greek historiography after the first century CE is, in its entirety, as follows: ‘later historians like Cassius Dio (e.g. 1, 5–7; 17, 57, 73; 36, 52), Appian (e.g. *Pun*, 77, 132) ... afford further examples [sc. ‘of sensationalism in history-writing’]’ (109; the omitted part of the sentence is about the slightly earlier Dionysius of Halicarnassus). Appian and Cassius Dio, to say nothing of Arrian and Herodian (who are not mentioned at all), collectively receive less coverage in this entry than do Homer (104), the Greek tragedians (107, 108, and 110), the Hebrew Bible (111), or Vergil’s *Aeneid* (108–9). The death of Turnus makes its traditional appearance on such occasions as the purportedly best instance of Aeneas’ pitiless behaviour towards the end of the epic (while the much more troubling episodes where Aeneas kills the equally suppliant Magus, against whom he has less personal reason for animus than Turnus,³⁰ and engages in human sacrifice of prisoners in the vein of Achilles,³¹ are, as is often the case, elided).

This distribution of coverage contributes to that uneasiness about what *LHG&L* actually means in describing itself as a lexicon of historiographical terms which we have already described as a potential issue. Desmond’s entry reads like a (very interesting) essay on pity as it appears in Greco-Roman literature, some of the evidence for which happens to be historiographical. At times, the focus of the article’s attention seems to be very much on the presentation of the Athenians in relation to pity (‘Nor did post-classical Athens lose her reputation for clemency’, 108). This is germane to the consideration of historiographers who are Athenian or who take Athens as their principal subject; it is less so to the consideration of the quite large number (Polybius, Cassius Dio, Arrian, Herodian) who are not, or do not. One also notes the article’s tendency to expatiate at some length on texts which are on the borders of history-writing (the biographer Plutarch gets an entire page, 108) or not from any historical genre at all. The last page of the entry (111) is devoted to philosophers, the Church Fathers, and, as aforementioned, the Bible. This renders it hard to see, at times, what makes Desmond’s analysis of *eleos*, capacious though that analysis is, ‘historiographical’ in its slant or utility.

One might fairly retort that terms as they appear in historiography can only fully be understood in relation to their wider appearance in the culture that produces historiographical texts. As John Marincola puts it at the conclusion of his article on *alētheia*: ‘in the end, historiographical *α*[*lētheia*] was based not only on the tools and conventions of the ancient historians, but also on the values and needs of the societies in which their histories were written and read’ (II.29). All the same, *LHG&L*’s distribution of material occasionally makes for

³⁰ Verg. *A.* 10.523–36.

³¹ Verg. *A.* 11.81–4.

a certain blurriness of focus in a work that purports to be historiographical in its central emphasis.

More troubling than the simple fact of this distribution, however, is the cast of thought which it occasionally betrays. Desmond's treatment of *eleos* in imperial Greek historiography, by contrast to the loving detail lavished upon Herodotus and Thucydides, is not just short; it is dismissive. Appian and Cassius Dio 'afford further examples' of historiographical sensationalism.

Desmond supplies a couple of cross-references in the case of each historian which are implied to demonstrate this thesis. These cross-references do not delineate the narrative contexts. The passages from Appian, if the interested reader looks them up, turn out to describe the distress at Carthage on being asked to render up hostages just before the outbreak of the Third Punic War,³² and Scipio Aemilianus weeping and quoting Homer when beholding the fall of the city at the war's conclusion.³³ Neither passage, in fact, uses the word *eleos*, although both certainly do depict pitiable scenes. Desmond does not mention the slight complication that the 'sensationalist' Appian goes on to assert that the latter events were placed by Polybius in his own history (which would actually reinforce the point about Polybius and pity that Desmond goes on to make in the next paragraph).³⁴

As it happens, Appian's oeuvre boasts more direct uses of *eleos* and its cognates than the two passages to which Desmond alludes. These passages are also more subtle and interesting than a simple charge of 'sensationalism' would allow. We might note, for example, the consistency with which the behaviour of Lucius Antonius during and after the siege of Perusia is explained in terms of pity towards the suffering of his men,³⁵ and the effect that this treatment has on the reader's response to him as an antagonist of Octavian. Such subtleties, however, and others in the work of Appian and his fellow imperial Greek historians, cannot be intuited from the entry for *eleos* in *LHG&L*.

Several Greek historians have survived to the present day more-or-less intact. Hundreds more endure in substantial fragments. It is unreasonable, of course, to ask that every historian should receive a substantial offering in every entry of *LHG&L* to which his remains might be somehow pertinent. One can also see the attraction of gearing most attention towards earlier historiographers. Theirs are the works in which we can usually see historiographical terms first being defined and interrogated.

For all that, an enterprise which aims at the coverage of classical historiography 'dalle origini alla tarda età imperiale' still admits a certain degree of

³² App. *Pun.* 356–9, or 77 in *LHG&L*'s numeration.

³³ App. *Pun.* 628–30, or 132 in *LHG&L*'s numeration.

³⁴ App. *Pun.* 631, or 133 in *LHG&L*'s numeration.

³⁵ App. *BC* 5.154, 157, 172.

obligation to keep the latter end of that period in view as well as the former. This is especially the case if its ultimate aim is to embrace the historiography of Rome alongside that of Greece. Wilamowitz may have derided Herodian as ‘ein nichtiger Nachamer’ and fulminated at what he regarded as that historian’s excessively high profile in Stephanus’ *Thesaurus*,³⁶ but Stephanus was not compiling a lexicon of historiography. Herodian (and Appian, and Arrian, and Cassius Dio) do not need to be eternally in attendance, but they deserve their meed of acknowledgment.

Some entries manage this better than others. So, for example, John Marincola’s article on *alētheia* appropriately notes (II.20) the position which this concept (admittedly accompanied by the possibility of textual corruption) seems to occupy in the preface of Herodian.³⁷ Later (II.25), Cassius Dio’s meditations on the subject are examined in connexion with the debate he presents between Agrippa and Maecenas.³⁸ It is also worth stressing that, although *LHG&L*’s coverage sometimes flags a little as it nears the historiography of the high Roman Empire, the fact that it generally takes that coverage even as far forward as it does is a notable advance. It is splendid that we have moved on from the days when ‘Greek Historiography’ was silently taken to encompass only Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon (with some reservations), and, if one was prepared to slum it a little, Polybius. Diodorus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus are, in general, quite a palpable presence in *LHG&L*. The lexicon is the richer for their inclusion.

In summary, then, *LHG&L* does not, so far, quite live up to one of its initial self-descriptions. It is not, in truth, ‘un repertorio ... di tutti i termini che concernono l’attività storiografica’. In terms of its current coverage, it does not fully embrace every term of interest to the student of historiography. Nor does its coverage of the terms which it does include always turn out to do full justice to the range of historiographical activity ‘dalle origini alla tarda età imperiale’ which is promised in the Introduction. On the other hand, it may legitimately be doubted whether a historiographical lexicon as comprehensive as this initial ambition seems to envisage could reasonably expect to be completed within

³⁶ von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1998) 25.

³⁷ Hdn. I.I.3.

³⁸ Dio 54.15.1–2.

an average lifetime. *LHG&L*, while not as definitive as it aspires to be, is certainly worth consultation on the terms it covers. I look forward to its future volumes.

Somerville College, Oxford

LUKE V. PITCHER
luke.pitcher@classics.ox.ac.uk

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bispham, E. H., T. J. Cornell, J. W. Rich, and C. J. Smith, edd. (2013) *The Fragments of the Roman Historians: Volume I – Introduction* (Oxford).
- Clark, A. (2007) *Divine Qualities: Cult and Community in Republican Rome* (Oxford).
- Hendrickson, G. L. (1937) review of A. S. F. Gow (1936) *A. E. Housman: A Sketch* (Cambridge), *AJP* 58: 462–7.
- Hornblower, S. (2003) *A Commentary on Thucydides: Volume I – Books I–III* (Oxford [repr. edn]).
- Parmeggiani, G., ed. (2014) *Between Thucydides & Polybius: The Golden Age of Greek Historiography* (Washington, D.C.).
- Volk, K. (2002) *The Poetics of Latin Didactic* (Oxford).
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. (1998) *Geschichte der Philologie* (Stuttgart and Leipzig [repr. edn; original 1921]).